

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
09/602,198	06/22/2000	Theodore G. Habing	068757.P063C	8408
37394 7	10/18/2004		EXAMINER	
TERENCE P.	. O'BRIEN		HWANG, VIC	TOR KENNY
	RTING GOODS CO. N MAWR AVE.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, II			3764	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	09/602,198	HABING ET AL.	
, tavico, y , tolici.	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Victor K. Hwang	3764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of AppelExamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced to a timely filed amendment which all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper re	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		•
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE terms on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. 136(a) and the appropriat fee. The appropriate ex	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	etion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			•
Claim(s) objected to: 52,57 and 67.			
Claim(s) rejected: 32-36,40,42,43,45-47,49-53,55-57	7 <u>,59,60 and 65-67</u> .	·	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Cortinuation Sheet</u>		Fra	
Victor K. Hwang Patent Examiner	Su	JUSTINE R. YU IPERVISORY PATENT E TECHNOLOGY CENTER	XAMINER 1 3700

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/602,198

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: New issues requiring further consideration and/or search include the secondary axes inclined from the vertical in a forward direction "less than horizontal"; "stops to limit the inward or outward travel of the press arm handles are not necessary"; and the arms "are inclined from the vertical.".

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims would remain rejected as in the Final Office action. Applicant's amendments to the independent claims do not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art applied. In each independent claim, the preamble has been amended to indicate that the exercise apparatus enables a full butterfly movement. The added description is not given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble language may not be treated as a limitation where it merely states an intended use of the system and is unnecessary to define the invention, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ruled May 8 (Catalina Marketing Int'l Inc. v. Coolsavings. com Inc., Fed. Cir., No. 01-1324, 5/8/02). With regard to amendments "wherein the press arms assume a natural rest position in which press arm handles are at a comfortable starting position for performance of a press exercise" is met by all of the prior art relied upon since "a comfortable starting position" is a relative description dependent upon each individual user and makes the phrase indefinite

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's request to vacate premature final rejection has been considered and is not granted since the claims amended January 23, 2004 included limitations not previously presented in the claims filed July 17, 2003. The added limitations of the secondary arms "extending downwardly at rest" in claim 32, "extend downwardly below the horizontal when at rest" in claim 46, and "extend downwardly at an angle below horizontal" in claim 60 were not previously presented in the claims. Though the limitations may be considered to have been expected to be claimed, the prior art relied upon was of record and presented in previous Office actions. The new grounds of rejection were necessitated by applicant's amendment and the final rejection was not premature.